

be ensured in the future Federal Democratic Union Constitution.

We will actively seek justice and accountability for all crimes committed by the military against the Rohingyas and all other people of Myanmar throughout our history. We intend if necessary to initiate processes to grant International Criminal Court jurisdiction over crimes committed within Myanmar against the Rohingyas and other communities.

We consider that the 88 recommendations set out in the final report of the Advisory Commission on Rakhine State chaired by Dr. Kofi Annan must play a crucial role in addressing the affairs in Rakhine State. These recommendations are based on solutions for the root causes of violence. However, over the past four years, much has changed to make the situation worse in Rakhine State for all ethnic groups there. Using these recommendations as well as other relevant recommendations as inputs, we earnestly believe that we can work together with all the people in Rakhine State to chart a new course towards a democratic inclusive and prosperous future.

We would also like to highlight the importance of legal matters in seeing to the Rakhine question. We will consider the opinions and views of the entire people in the country, including those in Rakhine State, in drafting a new constitution that can resolve the many problems caused by the 2008 constitution. The views and insights of all can contribute to this process. All the people in the country, including all stakeholders in Rakhine State, are invited to participate in the process of drafting the new constitution. Such dialogue is essential to creating a shared future for the country.

The process of repealing, amending, and promulgating laws, including the 1982 Citizenship Law, by the new constitution when the drafting is completed will be beneficial in resolving the conflict in Rakhine State. This new Citizenship Act must base citizenship on birth in Myanmar or birth anywhere as a child of Myanmar Citizens.

We further commit to abolishing the process of issuing National Verification Cards, a process that the military has used against Rohingyas and other ethnic groups coercively and with human rights violations. The Rohingyas are entitled to citizenship by laws that will accord with fundamental human rights norms and democratic federal principles.

The voluntary, safe, and dignified repatriation of Rohingyas who fled to neighbouring countries from Rakhine State due to Tatmadaw violence is a crucial matter. We reaffirm the agreements signed with neighbouring countries for the repatriation process. We are ready to cooperate with all stakeholders of good will in a special programme to implement the process. We are committed to the repatriation of Rohingyas as soon as repatriation can be accomplished voluntarily, safely, and with dignity.

The National Unity Government is a government whose primary duty is to fight the illegal military dictatorship. While we focus on this task, we are also planning for the future. We believe it will be beneficial in building the future democratic federal union to listen to all stakeholders in a spirit of collaboration.

Therefore, we invite Rohingyas to join hands with us and with others to participate in this Spring Revolution against the military dictatorship in all possible ways.

Mr. MCCONNELL. This statement represents months of work to build a cohesive, inclusive, and representative government and the best path toward national reconciliation and justice for

victims of the Tatmadaw's violence. So the NUG's efforts deserve the full support of the world's oldest democracy. The pro-democracy movement must know that the United States continues to stand with them and that we are ready to support the hard work of national reconciliation that still lies ahead.

ATTORNEY GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, Madam President, on one final matter, late last week, the Democratic leader and the Democratic whip gave in to the urge to pick at the scab of politically motivated investigations that have become their party's favorite weapon against the previous administration. They indicated that they were prepared to compel two former Attorneys General to testify before the Judiciary Committee on efforts to trace leaks of sensitive national security information.

In case anyone had forgotten, our colleagues are among the same Democrats who spent years demanding repeated investigations of a Republican President while turning a blind eye to the clear abuses of power that infected the investigation of his campaign. So any outrage from Democrats that alleged criminal leaks within their own ranks rightly drew the attention of Federal investigators rings completely hollow.

It is particularly disappointing that our colleagues have taken to attacking former Attorney General Bill Barr over investigative decisions that predated—predated—his time at the Department of Justice. Let me say that again. It is particularly disappointing that our colleagues have taken to attacking former Attorney General Bill Barr over investigative decisions that occurred when he wasn't there yet. Attorney General Barr served our Nation with honor and with integrity. These latest attempts to tarnish his name bear the telltale signs of a witch hunt in the making.

Here are the facts: The Department of Justice is empowered to investigate criminal conduct by Members of Congress and their staff. Necessarily, this sort of investigation is subject to strict procedural protections, and the Department's inspector general is fully equipped to determine whether these procedures were followed in this case. So I am confident that the existing inquiry will uncover the truth. There is no need for a partisan circus here in the Congress.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ATTORNEY GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I just heard the Republican Senate leader warn us not to initiate partisan investigations. It has only been a few weeks since he personally vetoed a bipartisan investigation of the attack on the U.S. Capitol on January 6 of this year.

For those of us who lived through that incident, we find it hard to understand why a 9/11-style Commission, divided equally between both political parties, is in any way a partisan investigation and why the Republican leader, who has served for so long in the Senate, would not feel awkward, in a way, walking through the halls of this Capitol and seeing the men and women of the Capitol Police force who have sent us a letter begging for a Commission to get to the bottom of what happened on that day when 140 men and women in uniform were attacked by this insurrectionist mob inspired by President Trump.

So when it comes to investigations, we have offered the most sanitized version of an investigation that one could ever ask for.

So why are we renewing this request when it comes to the information which is now before us? Well, on Friday, the DOJ inspector general announced he would investigate DOJ's use of subpoenas to obtain communication data from Members of Congress and the media, including whether the Department of Justice complied with applicable internal policies and whether its decisions were motivated by improper considerations.

What happened was, the previous President, Donald Trump, apparently had some channel into the Department of Justice where he could call for investigations and information and data to be collected about Members of Congress. He highlighted two Democratic Members of Congress who were, coincidentally, members of an investigative committee of the House Intelligence Committee. And then it turns out, in the last 2 days, he called for an investigation of his own White House Counsel.

So it is very hard to follow who was in charge in the White House. The Attorneys General at the time denied having any connection whatsoever to these investigations, and certainly the White House Counsel wouldn't have called for an investigation of himself. So who was running the show? It is a legitimate question because it gets to not only the issue of leaks, which is important, of course, but it gets to the more fundamental question of separation of powers in this government.

If Members of Congress are subject to investigation by a President for something other than corruption, then certainly this can be translated into political pressure on those individuals.

So I find it hard to follow the logic of the Republican Senate leader, who denies an investigation of the January 6

mob violence on the Capitol—a bipartisan investigation—and then turns around and says that the President could investigate Members of Congress without accountability either. You wonder if there is going to be the proper constitutional authority witnessed and exhibited in this circumstance.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, on a separate issue, the Senate voted on a bipartisan basis to invoke cloture on Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson's nomination to the DC Circuit. Today, the Senate will confirm her to that post.

Judge Jackson is the first of many circuit court nominees whom we will confirm during this Congress. Given her credentials and record on the bench, she is a nominee who deserves the support of Senators on both sides of the aisle. I would like to take just a minute to highlight why she is such an outstanding choice for the DC Circuit.

The importance of the DC Circuit cannot be overstated. This is what another Illinoisan, President Barack Obama, said about the court: "The D.C. Circuit is known as the second highest court in the country, and there's good reason for that. The judges on the D.C. Circuit routinely have the final say on a broad range of issues involving everything from national security to environmental policy; from questions of campaign finance to workers' rights. In other words, the court's decisions impact almost every aspect of our lives."

Thankfully, in Judge Jackson, we have a nominee who will be ready from day one to serve justice as a member of the DC Circuit.

Judge Jackson was born here in Washington, DC, and raised in Miami, FL. Her parents, public school teachers at the time of her birth, gave her a lifelong appreciation of learning and the law. They also instilled in her a dignity and grace that was on full display, as the Presiding Officer knows, when the judge appeared before the Judiciary Committee in April.

A champion high school debater, Jackson later attended Harvard and Harvard Law School before embarking on what can only be described as a star-studded legal career.

She clerked on the Federal District Court, the First Circuit Court of Appeals, and for Justice Breyer on the U.S. Supreme Court—a strong resume in and of itself. She has also worked at several prominent law firms, handling both trial and appellate work.

But her true calling has always been public service. In the early 2000s, Judge Jackson worked as special counsel on the U.S. Sentencing Commission and later served as a Federal public defender in Washington, DC. This experience inspired President Obama to nominate her to serve as Commissioner and Vice Chair of the Sentencing Commission. In the Senate, her nomination received unanimous support.

A few years later, Judge Jackson came before the Senate again when President Obama chose her to fill a vacancy on the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia—once again, she was confirmed with unanimous support.

Looking at the arc of Judge Jackson's career, I am struck by how much time she spent focusing on the issue of criminal sentencing—an issue deeply important to me and, I believe, many other colleagues.

From the Sentencing Commission to the Office of Federal Public Defender, to the district court, Judge Jackson has grappled with legal, intellectual, and moral challenges that come with sentencing policy and decisions. Once confirmed, she will bring that vital experience to the DC Circuit.

I also want to speak more broadly about her record on the bench. She represents the best of the judiciary. Humble, hard-working, she has written nearly 600 opinions, and each of them is guided by the same principles: fairness, impartiality, evenhandedness, and an unyielding fidelity to the law. It is no surprise, then, that she received the grade of unanimously "well qualified" from the American Bar Association, and it is no surprise that she has the support of legal experts and advocates from different ideological and professional stripes, including Judge Thomas Griffith, a George W. Bush appointee to the DC Circuit; the Alliance for Justice; the National Council of Jewish Women; the AFL-CIO; the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund; and dozens—literally dozens—of former prosecutors and other Justice Department officials appointed by Presidents of both political parties.

Let me close with a passage from a letter Judge Griffith wrote in support of Judge Jackson. I read this letter during her hearing, and it really stuck with me. Judge Griffith wrote: "Although she and I have sometimes differed on the best outcome of a case, I have always respected her careful approach and agreeable manner, two indispensable traits for success in a collegial body."

Madam President, we will all benefit from that careful approach and agreeable manner on the DC Circuit.

I will vote for Judge Jackson's nomination to the DC Circuit and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. DUCKWORTH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. LEE pertaining to the introduction of S. 2039 are printed in today's RECORD under "State-ments on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. LEE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

AMATEUR ATHLETES PROTECTION AND COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I am on the floor this afternoon to discuss the issue of student athletes having greater control over their name, image, and likeness.

Over the years, intercollegiate athletics have become a staple in American culture and higher education. No other country in the world has a sports college model that compares to ours, which affords thousands of young adults each year the opportunity to leverage their athletic ability into a quality education and continue playing the sport they love. But over the years, college athletics have grown into an increasingly profitable, billion-dollar industry, and the rules surrounding athlete compensation have not kept pace.

Now, individual States have created laws that will guarantee an amateur athlete the ability to profit off their name, image, and likeness without fear of being reprimanded. Again, I highlight that individual States have made those decisions and are creating laws. Nineteen States have now passed NIL legislation, and of those 19, 6 will go into effect in less a month—July 1, just, really, a few days away.

As more and more States continue to pass their own legislation, we are quickly headed for a system of inconsistent State laws that will be cumbersome and in some cases unworkable for athletes and the schools to navigate. Intercollegiate athletics are an inherently interstate matter. Our model makes certain the best teams and the best athletes compete against one another no matter their geographic location. This requires a single Federal standard that all schools and all athletes can operate under.

College sports and the opportunities they provide student athletes will be dramatically harmed if we are unable to pass a Federal standard. Each year, we will have States introducing or updating their NIL laws in order to gain just a bit more of an advantage in attracting athletes to their institutions.

We have already seen this begin to play out. Following California's passage of the first State NIL law in September 2019, there has been a rush of action by 18 other States to quickly follow suit, hoping to remain competitive as athletic departments recruit athletes to their States' schools. The floodgates will fully open on July 1—only 16 days away—when State NIL laws begin to take effect.

The time to act is now. There is a compromise to be found to both empowering amateur athletes to profit from their name, image, and likeness and guaranteeing greater protections, while at the same time maintaining the integrity of our one-of-a-kind collegiate model that has provided millions